### PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

## **PCT**

REC'D 1 6 JUL 2007

# INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT WIPO

(PCT Article 36 and Rule 70)

Applicant's or agent's file reference PCT/03-11	FOR FURTHER ACTION	See Notification of Transmittal of International Preliminary Examination Report (Form PCT/IPEA/416)				
International application No.	International filing date (day/mor	nth/year) Priority date (day/month/year)				
PCT/US04/11830	16 April 2004 (16.04.2004)	18 April 2003 (18.04.2003)				
International Patent Classification (IPC) of						
USPC: 435/189,6,168,257.2;536/23.2						
Applicant						
MIDWEST RESEARCH INSTITUTE						
<ol> <li>This international preliminary examination report has been prepared by this International Preliminary Examining Authority and is transmitted to the applicant according to Article 36.</li> <li>This REPORT consists of a total of sheets, including this cover sheet.</li> </ol>						
	T					
This report is also accompanied by ANNEXES, i.e., sheets of the description, claims and/or drawings which have been amended and are the basis for this report and/or sheets containing rectifications made						
		of the Administrative Instructions under the PCT).				
These annexes consist of a	total of sheets.	·				
3. This report contains indicat	tions relating to the following it	tems:				
I Basis of the repo	ort					
II Priority						
III Non-establishme	ent of report with regard to nove	elty, inventive step and industrial applicability				
IV \( \) Lack of unity of	invention					
	ent under Article 35(2) with reations and explanations support	gard to novelty, inventive step or industrial ling such statement				
VI Certain documer	nts cited					
VII Certain defects in	n the international application					
	ions on the international applica	ation				
Date of submission of the demand	Date	of completion of this report				
03 February 2005 (03.02.2005)	20 Jur	ne 2007 (20.06.2007)				
Name and mailing address of the IPEA/US  Mail Stop PCT, Attn: IPEA/ US	Autho	orized officer				
Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450	Ponna	athapu Achutamurthy Janiel Force				
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450	Telepl	orized officer athapu Achutamurthy hone No. 571-272-1600				
Facsimile No. (571) 273-3201 Form PCT/IPEA/409 (cover sheet)(July 199						

International application No.	
PCT/US04/11830	

I.	Basis	s of the report
1.	With	regard to the elements of the international application:*
	$\boxtimes$	the international application as originally filed.
	$\bowtie$	the description:
		pages 1-27 as originally filed pages NONE , filed with the demand
		pages NONE, filed with the letter of
	$\boxtimes$	the claims:
		pages 28 and 29 , as originally filed
		pages NONE, as amended (together with any statement) under Article 19 pages NONE, filed with the demand
		pages NONE , filed with the letter of
	$\boxtimes$	the drawings:
		pages 1-6 as originally filed
		pages NONE , filed with the demand pages NONE , filed with the letter of
	П	the sequence listing part of the description:
		pages NONE , as originally filed
		pages NONE , filed with the demand
2	W/i+h	pages NONE, filed with the letter of  regard to the language, all the elements marked above were available or furnished to this Authority in the
۷.		page in which the international application was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
	Thes	e elements were available or furnished to this Authority in the following language which is:
		the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule23.1(b)).
	Ц	the language of publication of the international application (under Rule 48.3(b)).
	Ш	the language of the translation furnished for the purposes of international preliminary examination(under Rules 55.2 and/or 55.3).
3.		regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application, the national preliminary examination was carried out on the basis of the sequence listing:
		contained in the international application in printed form.
	$\boxtimes$	filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
		furnished subsequently to this Authority in written form.
		furnished subsequently to this Authority in computer readable form.
	Ш	The statement that the subsequently furnished written sequence listing does not go beyond the disclosure in the international application as filed has been furnished.
		The statement that the information recorded in computer readable form is identical to the written sequence listing has been furnished.
4.		The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of
		the description, pages <u>NONE</u>
		the claims, Nos. NONE
		the drawings, sheets/ <del>fig</del> NONE
5.		This report has been established as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed, as indicated in the Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(c)).**
this	repoi	rement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in It as "originally filed" and are not annexed to this report since they do not contain amendments (Rules 70.16 and 70.17). Opplacement sheet containing such amendments must be referred to under item 1 and annexed to this report.

International application No.

PCT/US04/11830

	n-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability	
1. The question whether the claimed invention appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non-obvious), or to be industrially applicable have not been and will not be examined in respect of:		
	the entire international application,	
$\boxtimes$	claims Nos. <u>4-18</u>	
becau	se:	
	the said international application, or the said claim Nos relate to the following subject matter which does not require international preliminary examination (specify):	
	the description, claims or drawings (indicate particular elements below) or said claims Nos are so unclear that no meaningful opinion could be formed (specify):	
	the claims, or said claims Nos are so inadequately supported by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed.	
$\boxtimes$	no international search report has been established for said claims Nos. 4-18	
2. A meaningful international preliminary examination cannot be carried out due to the failure of the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing to comply with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions:		
	the written form has not been furnished or does not comply with the standard.	
	the computer readable form has not been furnished or does not comply with the standard.	

Form PCT/IPEA/409 (Box III) (July 1998)

International application No.
PCT/US04/11830

IV. Lack of unity of invention		
re	se to the invitation to restrict or pay additional fees the applicant has: estricted the claims. aid additional fees. aid additional fees under protest. either restricted nor paid additional fees.	
	This Authority found that the requirement of unity of invention is not complied with and chose, according to tule 68.1, not to invite the applicant to restrict or pay additional fees.	
3. This Autl	hority considers that the requirement of unity of invention is accordance with Rules 13.1, 13.2 and 13.3 is	
⊠ n	omplied with. ot complied with for the following reasons:	
Please See Co	ontinuation Sheet	
examinat	ently, the following parts of the international application were the subject of international preliminary tion in establishing this report:  Il parts.  the parts relating to claims Nos. 1-3	

International application No. PCT/US04/11830

V. Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicabilicitations and explanations supporting such statement  1. STATEMENT  Novelty (N)  Claims NONE  Claims 1-3  Inventive Step (IS)  Claims NONE  Claims 1-3  Industrial Applicability (IA)  Claims 1-3  Claims NONE  Claims 1-3  Claims NONE  2. CITATIONS AND EXPLANATIONS  Claims 1-3 lack novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by Dillon et al. (PGPUB US 2004/0209256 A1, publicat 10/21/2004, claim priority of US copending application 10/411,910 filed on 4/1/2/2003). Dillon et al. lateach an oxygen-tolerant resistant iron hydrogenase, which can produce hydrogen in presence of oxygen. Dillon et al. lateach an oxygen-tolerant resistant iron hydrogenase, which are made by substitution of one or more amino acid residues preferably at amino acid positions in and near site of hydrogenase resulting in oxygen tolerant or resistant hydrogenase. The mutants or variants of Dillon et al. inherently pos mutation/substitution at the recited position of the instant application of claim 2 (see p1 col. 1-2). Since the Office does not have the facilities for examining and comparing applicants modified protein with mutations at specific positions with the the mutant orvariant protein of the prior art, the burden is on the applicant to show a novel or unobvious diffe between the claimed modified product and the product of the prior art, the burden is on the applicant to show a novel or unobvious diffe between the claimed modified product and the product of the prior art, the burden is on the applicant to show a novel or unobvious diffe between the claimed modified product and the product of the prior art (i.e., that the protein of the prior and does not possess the unaterial structural and functional characteristics of the claimed protein). See In re Best, 562 F.2d 1252, 195 USPQ 430 (CCPA and In re Fitzgerald et al., 205 USPQ 594.	
Inventive Step (IS)  Claims NONE  Claims 1-3  Industrial Applicability (IA)  Claims 1-3  Claims NONE  Claims 1-3  Industrial Applicability (IA)  Claims 1-3  Claims NONE  Claims 1-3  Claims NONE  Claims 1-3  Claims 1-3  Claims 1-3 lack novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by Dillon et al. (PGPUB US 2004/0209256 A1, publica 10/21/2004, claim priority of US copending application 10/411,910 filed on 4/12/2003). Dillon et al. teach an oxygen-tolerant cresistant iron hydrogenase, which can produce hydrogen in presence of oxygen. Dillon et al. so teach fragments or variants of hydrogenase, which are made by substitution of one or more amino acid residues preferably at amino acid positions in and near site of hydrogenase resulting in oxygen tolerant or resistant hydrogenase. The mutants or variants of Dillon et al. inherently pos mutation/substitution at the recited position of the instant application of claim 2 (see p1 col. 1-2).  Since the Office does not have the facilities for examining and comparing applicants' modified protein with mutations at specific positions with the the mutant orvariant protein of the prior art, the burden is on the applicant to show a novel or unobvious diffe between the claimed modified product and the product of the prior art (i.e., that the protein of the prior art does not possess the smaterial structural and functional characteristics of the claimed protein). See In re Best, 562 F.2d 1252, 195 USPQ 430 (CCPA and In re Fitzgerald et al., 205 USPQ 594.  Claims 1-3 meets the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4), and thus meets industrial applicability because the subject matter claims.	lity;
Inventive Step (IS)  Claims 1-3  Industrial Applicability (IA)  Claims 1-3  Claims NONE  Claims 1-3 lack novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by Dillon et al. (PGPUB US 2004/0209256 A1, publicat 10/21/2004, claim priority of US copending application 10/411,910 filed on 4/12/2003). Dillon et al. teach an oxygen-tolerant cresistant iron hydrogenase, which can produce hydrogen in presence of oxygen. Dillon et al. also teach fragments or variants of hydrogenase, which are made by substitution of one or more amino acid residues preferably at amino acid positions in and near site of hydrogenase resulting in oxygen tolerant or resistant hydrogenase. The mutants or variants of Dillon et al. inherently pos mutation/substitution at the recited position of the instant application of claim 2 (see p1 col. 1-2).  Since the Office does not have the facilities for examining and comparing applicants' modified protein with mutations at specific between the claimed modified product and the product of the prior art (i.e., that the protein of the prior art does not possess the material structural and functional characteristics of the claimed protein). See In re Best, 562 F.2d 1252, 195 USPQ 430 (CCPA and In re Fitzgerald et al., 205 USPQ 594.  Claims 1-3 meets the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4), and thus meets industrial applicability because the subject matter claims.	
Inventive Step (IS)  Claims 1-3  Industrial Applicability (IA)  Claims 1-3  Claims NONE  Claims 1-3 lack novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by Dillon et al. (PGPUB US 2004/0209256 A1, publicat 10/21/2004, claim priority of US copending application 10/411,910 filed on 4/12/2003). Dillon et al. teach an oxygen-tolerant cresistant iron hydrogenase, which can produce hydrogen in presence of oxygen. Dillon et al. also teach fragments or variants of hydrogenase, which are made by substitution of one or more amino acid residues preferably at amino acid positions in and near site of hydrogenase resulting in oxygen tolerant or resistant hydrogenase. The mutants or variants of Dillon et al. inherently pos mutation/substitution at the recited position of the instant application of claim 2 (see p1 col. 1-2).  Since the Office does not have the facilities for examining and comparing applicants' modified protein with mutations at specific between the claimed modified product and the product of the prior art (i.e., that the protein of the prior art does not possess the material structural and functional characteristics of the claimed protein). See In re Best, 562 F.2d 1252, 195 USPQ 430 (CCPA and In re Fitzgerald et al., 205 USPQ 594.  Claims 1-3 meets the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4), and thus meets industrial applicability because the subject matter claims.	YES
Industrial Applicability (IA)  Claims 1-3  Claims NONE  Claims 1-3  Claims NONE  Claims 1-3  Claims NONE  Claims 1-3  Claims NONE  Claims 1-3 lack novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by Dillon et al. (PGPUB US 2004/0209256 A1, publica 10/21/2004, claim priority of US copending application 10/411,910 filed on 4/12/2003). Dillon et al. teach an oxygen-tolerant or resistant iron hydrogenase, which can produce hydrogen in presence of oxygen. Dillon et al. also teach fragments or variants of hydrogenase, which are made by substitution of one or more amino acid residues preferably at amino acid positions in and near site of hydrogenase resulting in oxygen tolerant or resistant hydrogenase. The mutants or variants of Dillon et al. inherently pos mutation/substitution at the recited position of the instant application of claim 2 (see p1 col. 1-2).  Since the Office does not have the facilities for examining and comparing applicants' modified protein with mutations at specific positions with the the mutant orvariant protein of the prior art, the burden is on the applicant to show a novel or unobvious differ between the claimed modified product and the product of the prior art (i.e., that the protein of the prior art does not possess the material structural and functional characteristics of the claimed protein). See In re Best, 562 F.2d 1252, 195 USPQ 430 (CCPA and In re Fitzgerald et al., 205 USPQ 594.  Claims 1-3 meets the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4), and thus meets industrial applicability because the subject matter claimed protein such as the protein of the subject matter claimed protein applicability because the subject matter claimed protein such as protein and the protein description and thus meets industrial applicability because the subject matter claimed protein such as protein and the protein claimed protein applicability because the subject matter claimed protein such as protein and protein and protein and protein and the protein claimed protein and the protein claimed protein and p	NO
Industrial Applicability (IA)  Claims 1-3  Claims 1-3  Claims NONE  2. CITATIONS AND EXPLANATIONS  Claims 1-3 lack novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by Dillon et al. (PGPUB US 2004/0209256 A1, publicat 10/21/2004, claim priority of US copending application 10/411,910 filed on 4/12/2003). Dillon et al. teach an oxygen-tolerant or resistant iron hydrogenase, which can produce hydrogen in presence of oxygen. Dillon et al. also teach fragments or variants of hydrogenase, which are made by substitution of one or more amino acid residues preferably at amino acid positions in and near site of hydrogenase resulting in oxygen tolerant or resistant hydrogenase. The mutants or variants of Dillon et al. inherently pos mutation/substitution at the recited position of the instant application of claim 2 (see p1 col. 1-2).  Since the Office does not have the facilities for examining and comparing applicants' modified protein with mutations at specific positions with the the mutant orvariant protein of the prior art, the burden is on the applicant to show a novel or unobvious diffe between the claimed modified product and the product of the prior art (i.e., that the protein of the prior art does not possess the material structural and functional characteristics of the claimed protein). See In re Best, 562 F.2d 1252, 195 USPQ 430 (CCPA and In re Fitzgerald et al., 205 USPQ 594.  Claims 1-3 meets the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4), and thus meets industrial applicability because the subject matter claims.	<u> </u>
Industrial Applicability (IA)  Claims 1-3  Claims 1-4  Claims 1-4  Claims 1-4  Claims 1-4  Claims 1-7  Claims 1-8	YES
Claims NONE  2. CITATIONS AND EXPLANATIONS  Claims 1-3 lack novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by Dillon et al. (PGPUB US 2004/0209256 A1, publication 10/21/2004, claim priority of US copending application 10/411,910 filed on 4/12/2003). Dillon et al. teach an oxygen-tolerant or resistant iron hydrogenase, which can produce hydrogen in presence of oxygen. Dillon et al. also teach fragments or variants of hydrogenase, which are made by substitution of one or more amino acid residues preferably at amino acid positions in and near site of hydrogenase resulting in oxygen tolerant or resistant hydrogenase. The mutants or variants of Dillon et al. inherently pos mutation/substitution at the recited position of the instant application of claim 2 (see p1 col. 1-2).  Since the Office does not have the facilities for examining and comparing applicants' modified protein with mutations at specific positions with the the mutant orvariant protein of the prior art, the burden is on the applicant to show a novel or unobvious difference the claimed modified product and the product of the prior art (i.e., that the protein of the prior art does not possess the substitutional characteristics of the claimed protein). See In re Best, 562 F.2d 1252, 195 USPQ 430 (CCPA and In re Fitzgerald et al., 205 USPQ 594.  Claims 1-3 meets the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4), and thus meets industrial applicability because the subject matter claims.	NO
Claims NONE  2. CITATIONS AND EXPLANATIONS  Claims 1-3 lack novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by Dillon et al. (PGPUB US 2004/0209256 A1, publication 10/21/2004, claim priority of US copending application 10/411,910 filed on 4/12/2003). Dillon et al. teach an oxygen-tolerant or resistant iron hydrogenase, which can produce hydrogen in presence of oxygen. Dillon et al. also teach fragments or variants of hydrogenase, which are made by substitution of one or more amino acid residues preferably at amino acid positions in and near site of hydrogenase resulting in oxygen tolerant or resistant hydrogenase. The mutants or variants of Dillon et al. inherently pos mutation/substitution at the recited position of the instant application of claim 2 (see p1 col. 1-2).  Since the Office does not have the facilities for examining and comparing applicants' modified protein with mutations at specific positions with the the mutant orvariant protein of the prior art, the burden is on the applicant to show a novel or unobvious difference the claimed modified product and the product of the prior art (i.e., that the protein of the prior art does not possess the substitutional characteristics of the claimed protein). See In re Best, 562 F.2d 1252, 195 USPQ 430 (CCPA and In re Fitzgerald et al., 205 USPQ 594.  Claims 1-3 meets the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4), and thus meets industrial applicability because the subject matter claims.	
2. CITATIONS AND EXPLANATIONS  Claims 1-3 lack novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by Dillon et al. (PGPUB US 2004/0209256 A1, publicat 10/21/2004, claim priority of US copending application 10/411,910 filed on 4/12/2003). Dillon et al. teach an oxygen-tolerant or resistant iron hydrogenase, which can produce hydrogen in presence of oxygen. Dillon et al. also teach fragments or variants of hydrogenase, which are made by substitution of one or more amino acid residues preferably at amino acid positions in and near site of hydrogenase resulting in oxygen tolerant or resistant hydrogenase. The mutants or variants of Dillon et al. inherently pos mutation/substitution at the recited position of the instant application of claim 2 (see p1 col. 1-2).  Since the Office does not have the facilities for examining and comparing applicants' modified protein with mutations at specifi positions with the the mutant orvariant protein of the prior art, the burden is on the applicant to show a novel or unobvious difference between the claimed modified product and the product of the prior art (i.e., that the protein of the prior art does not possess the smaterial structural and functional characteristics of the claimed protein). See In re Best, 562 F.2d 1252, 195 USPQ 430 (CCPA and In re Fitzgerald et al., 205 USPQ 594.  Claims 1-3 meets the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4), and thus meets industrial applicability because the subject matter claims.	YES
Claims 1-3 lack novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by Dillon et al. (PGPUB US 2004/0209256 A1, publication 10/21/2004, claim priority of US copending application 10/411,910 filed on 4/12/2003). Dillon et al. teach an oxygen-tolerant or resistant iron hydrogenase, which can produce hydrogen in presence of oxygen. Dillon et al. also teach fragments or variants of hydrogenase, which are made by substitution of one or more amino acid residues preferably at amino acid positions in and near site of hydrogenase resulting in oxygen tolerant or resistant hydrogenase. The mutants or variants of Dillon et al. inherently pos mutation/substitution at the recited position of the instant application of claim 2 (see p1 col. 1-2). Since the Office does not have the facilities for examining and comparing applicants' modified protein with mutations at specifi positions with the the mutant orvariant protein of the prior art, the burden is on the applicant to show a novel or unobvious different between the claimed modified product and the product of the prior art (i.e., that the protein of the prior art does not possess the smaterial structural and functional characteristics of the claimed protein). See In re Best, 562 F.2d 1252, 195 USPQ 430 (CCPA and In re Fitzgerald et al., 205 USPQ 594.  Claims 1-3 meets the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4), and thus meets industrial applicability because the subject matter claims.	NО
Claims 1-3 lack novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by Dillon et al. (PGPUB US 2004/0209256 A1, publication 10/21/2004, claim priority of US copending application 10/411,910 filed on 4/12/2003). Dillon et al. teach an oxygen-tolerant or resistant iron hydrogenase, which can produce hydrogen in presence of oxygen. Dillon et al. also teach fragments or variants of hydrogenase, which are made by substitution of one or more amino acid residues preferably at amino acid positions in and near site of hydrogenase resulting in oxygen tolerant or resistant hydrogenase. The mutants or variants of Dillon et al. inherently pos mutation/substitution at the recited position of the instant application of claim 2 (see p1 col. 1-2). Since the Office does not have the facilities for examining and comparing applicants' modified protein with mutations at specifi positions with the the mutant orvariant protein of the prior art, the burden is on the applicant to show a novel or unobvious different between the claimed modified product and the product of the prior art (i.e., that the protein of the prior art does not possess the smaterial structural and functional characteristics of the claimed protein). See In re Best, 562 F.2d 1252, 195 USPQ 430 (CCPA and In re Fitzgerald et al., 205 USPQ 594.  Claims 1-3 meets the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4), and thus meets industrial applicability because the subject matter claims.	
	or of or of or active asses the fic ference assame of

Form PCT/IPEA/409 (Box V) (July 1998)

International application No. PCT/US04/11830

Supplemental Box

(To be used when the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient)

## IV. 3. This Authority considers that the requirement of unity of invention is accordance with Rules 13.1, 13.2 and 13.3 is not complied with for the following reasons:

Group, I claim(s) 1-3, drawn to an oxygen-resistant iron hydrogenase polypeptide derived from oxygen-sensitive iron hydrogenase by substitution at position 78 of HydA1 iron hydrogenase.

Group, II claim(s) 1-3, drawn to an oxygen-resistant iron hydrogenase polypeptide derived from oxygen-sensitive iron hydrogenase by substitution at position 240 of HydA1 iron hydrogenase.

Group, III claim(s) 1-3, drawn to an oxygen-resistant iron hydrogenase polypeptide derived from oxygen-sensitive iron hydrogenase by substitution at position 244 of HydA1 iron hydrogenase.

Group, IV claim(s) 1-3, drawn to an oxygen-resistant iron hydrogenase polypeptide derived from oxygen-sensitive iron hydrogenase by substitution at position 86 of HydA1 iron hydrogenase.

Group, V claim(s) 1-3, drawn to an oxygen-resistant iron hydrogenase polypeptide derived from oxygen-sensitive iron hydrogenase by substitution at position 248 of HydA1 iron hydrogenase.

Group, VI claim(s) 1-3, drawn to an oxygen-resistant iron hydrogenase polypeptide derived from oxygen-sensitive iron hydrogenase by substitution at position 247 of HydA1 iron hydrogenase.

Group, VII claim(s) 1-3, drawn to an oxygen-resistant iron hydrogenase polypeptide derived from oxygen-sensitive iron hydrogenase by substitution at position 82 of HydA1 iron hydrogenase.

Group, VIII claim(s) 1-3, drawn to an oxygen-resistant iron hydrogenase polypeptide derived from oxygen-sensitive iron hydrogenase by substitution at position 89 of HydA1 iron hydrogenase.

Group, IX claim(s) 1-3, drawn to an oxygen-resistant iron hydrogenase polypeptide derived from oxygen-sensitive iron hydrogenase by substitution at position 355 of HydA1 iron hydrogenase.

Group, X claim(s) 1-3, drawn to an oxygen-resistant iron hydrogenase polypeptide derived from oxygen-sensitive iron hydrogenase by substitution at position 93 of HydA1 iron hydrogenase.

Group, XI claim(s) 1-3, drawn to an oxygen-resistant iron hydrogenase polypeptide derived from oxygen-sensitive iron hydrogenase by substitution at position 252 of HydA1 iron hydrogenase.

Group, XII claim(s) 4-7, drawn to a polynucleotide encoding oxygen-resistant iron hydrogenase polypeptide derived from oxygen-sensitive iron hydrogenase by substitution at position 78 of HydA1 iron hydrogenase.

Group, XIII claim(s) 4-7, drawn to a polynucleotide encoding oxygen-resistant iron hydrogenase polypeptide derived from oxygen-sensitive iron hydrogenase by substitution at position 240 of HydA1 iron hydrogenase.

Group, XIV claim(s) 4-7, drawn to a polynucleotide encoding oxygen-resistant iron hydrogenase polypeptide derived from oxygen-sensitive iron hydrogenase by substitution at position 244 of HydA1 iron hydrogenase.

Group, XV claim(s) 4-7, drawn to a polynucleotide encoding oxygen-resistant iron hydrogenase polypeptide derived from oxygen-sensitive iron hydrogenase by substitution at position 86 of HydA1 iron hydrogenase.

Group, XVI claim(s) 4-7, drawn to a polynucleotide encoding oxygen-resistant iron hydrogenase polypeptide derived from oxygen-sensitive iron hydrogenase by substitution at position 248 of HydA1 iron hydrogenase.

Group, XVII claim(s) 4-7, drawn to a polynucleotide encoding oxygen-resistant iron hydrogenase polypeptide derived from oxygen-sensitive iron hydrogenase by substitution at position 247 of HydA1 iron hydrogenase.

Group, XVIII claim(s) 4-7, drawn to a polynucleotide encoding oxygen-resistant iron hydrogenase polypeptide derived from oxygen-sensitive iron hydrogenase by substitution at position 82 of HydA1 iron hydrogenase.

Group, XIX claim(s) 4-7, drawn to a polynucleotide encoding oxygen-resistant iron hydrogenase polypeptide derived from oxygen-sensitive iron hydrogenase by substitution at position 89 of HydA1 iron hydrogenase.

Group, XX claim(s) 4-7, drawn to a polynucleotide encoding oxygen-resistant iron hydrogenase polypeptide derived from oxygen-sensitive iron hydrogenase by substitution at position 355 of HydA1 iron hydrogenase.

International application No. PCT/US04/11830

Supplemental Box (To be used when the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient)			
Group, XXI claim(s) 4-7, drawn to a polynucleotide encoding oxygen-resistant iron hydrogenase polypeptide derived from sensitive iron hydrogenase by substitution at position 93 of HydA1 iron hydrogenase.  Group, XXII claim(s) 4-7, drawn to a polynucleotide encoding oxygen-resistant iron hydrogenase polypeptide derived from sensitive iron hydrogenase by substitution at position 252 of HydA1 iron hydrogenase.  Group, XXIII claim(s) 8-9 and 13, drawn to a method of producing hydrogen in green algae.  Group, XXIV claim(s) 10-12, drawn to a method of making nucleic acid encoding an oxygen-resistant iron hydrogenase.  Group, XXV claim(s) 14-18, drawn to a method of making an oxygen-resistant iron-hydrogenase.			
·			